Table D-16a. Housing Projects by County

County	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Cost Per
-	Projects	Cost		Cost in CIP	Capita
Cannon	1	\$ 500,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$ 39
Carroll	1	500,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$ 17
Cheatham	1	1,000,000	1.3%	0.0%	\$ 27
Clay	1	220,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 28
Cumberland	2	775,000	1.0%	100.0%	\$ 16
Davidson	2	52,100,000	66.1%	100.0%	\$ 92
DeKalb	2	2,524,382	3.2%	0.0%	\$ 144
Gibson	2	1,300,000	1.6%	23.1%	\$ 27
Haywood	1	540,000	0.7%	100.0%	\$ 27
Humphreys	3	4,930,000	6.3%	0.0%	\$ 272
Jackson	3	2,580,000	3.3%	80.6%	\$ 231
Macon	1	137,500	0.2%	100.0%	\$ 7
Obion	1	146,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 5
Overton	3	1,500,000	1.9%	0.0%	\$ 74
Perry	2	1,500,000	1.9%	0.0%	\$ 200
Putnam	2	4,650,000	5.9%	100.0%	\$ 74
Rutherford	1	500,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$ 3
Wayne	2	2,943,000	3.7%	0.0%	\$ 175
White	1	500,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$ 21
Statewide Total	32	\$ 78,845,882	100.0%	76.8%	\$ 14

<sup>\*</sup> Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

<sup>\*\*</sup>Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Table D-16b. Housing Projects by County and by Stage of Development

	Conceptual				Planning & Design				Construction			
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	nillions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in i	millions]
Cannon	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%	1	100.0%	\$ 0.5	100.0%
Carroll	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cheatham	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Clay	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cumberland	1	50.0%	0.5	64.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.3	35.5%
Davidson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	52.1	100.0%
DeKalb	2	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Gibson	2	100.0%	1.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Haywood	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%
Humphreys	3	100.0%	4.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jackson	3	100.0%	2.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Macon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Obion	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Overton	3	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Perry	1	50.0%	1.0	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.5	33.3%
Putnam	1	50.0%	1.7	35.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	3.0	64.5%
Rutherford	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Wayne	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
White	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Statewide	22	68.8%	\$ 18.9	23.9%	3	9.4%	\$ 3.1	3.9%	7	21.9%	\$ 56.9	72.2%

<sup>\*</sup> Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Table D-17a. Recreation Projects by County

	-	lod daly 2002 tillod	_			
County	Number of Projects	Total Estimated Cost	Percent of	Percent Cost in CIP		st Per apita
Anderson	27	\$ 8,489,800	1.0%	92.2%	\$	119
Bedford	13	3,196,000	0.4%	0.0%	э \$	83
	2	1		0.0%	э \$	63
Benton	2	1,048,000	0.1%			
Bledsoe	7	14,060,000	1.7%	0.0%	\$	1,123
Blount		2,598,000	0.3%	68.7%	\$	24
Bradley	2	395,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	4
Campbell	9	8,582,972	1.0%	74.3%	\$	214
Cannon	2	125,000	0.0%	60.0%	\$	10
Carroll	4	1,585,000	0.2%	88.3%	\$	54
Carter	8	3,886,000	0.5%	21.3%	\$	68
Cheatham	5	8,200,000	1.0%	0.0%	\$	224
Chester	3	8,575,000	1.0%	0.9%	\$	546
Claiborne	5	3,808,000	0.5%	11.8%	\$	126
Cumberland	3	2,225,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	46
Davidson	35	120,511,000	14.5%	100.0%	\$	213
Decatur	3	650,000	0.1%	76.9%	\$	56
DeKalb	1	870,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	50
Dickson	6	3,095,000	0.4%	8.1%	\$	71
Fayette	1	500,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	16
Fentress	2	1,710,000	0.2%	8.8%	\$	102
Franklin	5	2,562,510	0.3%	0.0%	\$	64
Gibson	4	5,090,000	0.6%	29.5%	\$	106
Giles	7	830,928	0.1%	0.0%	\$	28
Grainger	3	500,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	24
Greene	4	1,300,000	0.2%	50.0%	\$	21
Grundy	4	480,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	34
Hamblen	4	7,719,982	0.9%	93.3%	\$	132
Hamilton	38	17,202,480	2.1%	0.0%	\$	56
Hancock	2	180,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	27
Hardeman	6	415,000	0.0%	12.0%	\$	15
Hardin	8	2,015,000	0.2%	71.2%	\$	78
Hawkins	7	1,358,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	25
Haywood	3	555,000	0.1%	68.5%	\$	28
Henderson	3	2,290,000	0.1%	4.4%		89
Henry	4	5,610,000	0.7%	5.3%		180
Hickman	1	160,000	0.7 %	0.0%	\$	7
	3	380,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	10
Houston		· '				48
Humphreys	3	410,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	23
Jefferson	5	2,629,000	0.3%	40.7%	\$	58
Johnson	3	3,430,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	194
Knox	29	99,420,716	11.9%	47.7%	\$	258
Lake	1	200,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	26
Lauderdale	1	3,500,000	0.4%	100.0%	\$	130
Lawrence	4	1,565,815	0.2%	0.0%	\$	39

Table D-17a. (continued)

	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Cos	t Per
County	Projects	Cost		Cost in CIP		pita
Lewis	4	3,800,000	0.5%		\$	332
Lincoln	3	1,450,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	46
Loudon	7	17,290,000	2.1%	90.7%	\$	430
McMinn	7	3,325,000	0.4%	97.0%	\$	67
McNairy	14	4,508,000	0.5%	39.1%	\$	183
Macon	3	6,560,000	0.8%	100.0%	\$	314
Madison	6	4,453,000	0.5%	100.0%	\$	48
Marion	2	150,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	5
Marshall	7	4,958,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$	183
Maury	7	16,085,500	1.9%	95.7%	\$	229
Meigs	1	700,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	63
Monroe	5	3,567,500	0.4%	54.0%	\$	90
Montgomery	14	39,970,000	4.8%	91.2%	\$	296
Morgan	2	342,000	0.0%	73.1%	\$	17
Overton	1	150,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$	7
Pickett	1	220,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	44
Polk	1	75,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	5
Putnam	5	2,445,000	0.3%	26.6%	\$	39
Rhea	1	250,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	9
Roane	12	8,180,000	1.0%	2.2%	\$	157
Robertson	7	9,345,000	1.1%	95.5%	\$	167
Rutherford	14	26,428,350	3.2%	98.7%	\$	139
Scott	4	4,352,240	0.5%	0.0%	\$	202
Sequatchie	1	150,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	13
Sevier	5	1,526,470	0.2%	19.6%	\$	21
Shelby	97	182,305,784	21.9%	97.9%	\$	203
Smith	1	200,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$	11
Stewart	6	2,929,000	0.4%	22.8%	\$	232
Sullivan	23	15,860,000	1.9%	80.0%	\$	104
Sumner	12	21,074,100	2.5%	3.1%	\$	157
Tipton	1	500,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	9
Unicoi	9	2,359,340	0.3%	0.0%	\$	133
Union	2	250,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	14
Van Buren	2	2,110,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	385
Warren	2	230,000	0.0%			6
Washington	14	11,055,385	1.3%	92.8%		102
Wayne	4	1,252,700	0.2%	0.0%		74
Weakley	3	800,000	0.1%	0.0%		23
White	1	300,000	0.0%	100.0%		13
Williamson	21	55,490,000	6.7%	35.1%		415
Wilson	4	21,500,000	2.6%			234
Regional	2	665,000	0.1%	0.0%		0
Statewide	630	\$ 833,076,572	100.0%	65.9%		146

<sup>\*</sup> Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

\*\*Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Appendix D: Reported Infrastructure Needs by County

 Table D-17b. Recreation Projects by County and by Stage of Development

					t—Five-year Period July 2002 through							
			eptual		Planning & Design			Construction				
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in i			mber	Cost [in		Nur	nber	Cost [in m	
Anderson	13	48.1%	\$ 2.7	31.6%	11	40.7%	\$ 4.3	50.5%	3	11.1%	\$ 1.5	17.9%
Bedford	10	76.9%	2.9	90.8%	1	7.7%	0.1	4.1%	2	15.4%	0.2	5.2%
Benton	1	50.0%	0.6	53.4%	1	50.0%	0.5	46.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Bledsoe	2	100.0%	14.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Blount	2	28.6%	1.8	69.3%	4	57.1%	0.7	28.3%	1	14.3%	0.1	2.5%
Bradley	2	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Campbell	5	55.6%	1.9	22.4%	2	22.2%	6.4	74.3%	2	22.2%	0.3	3.4%
Cannon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0.1	100.0%
Carroll	1	25.0%	0.1	6.9%	1	25.0%	0.1	4.7%	2	50.0%	1.4	88.3%
Carter	6	75.0%	3.3	85.2%	2	25.0%	0.6	14.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cheatham	3	60.0%	5.4	65.9%	1	20.0%	1.5	18.3%	1	20.0%	1.3	15.9%
Chester	3	100.0%	8.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Claiborne	2	40.0%	2.2	56.5%	1	20.0%	0.5	13.3%	2	40.0%	1.2	30.2%
Cumberland	3	100.0%	2.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Davidson	3	8.6%	3.0	2.5%	14	40.0%	47.5	39.4%	18	51.4%	70.0	58.1%
Decatur	3	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
DeKalb	1	100.0%	0.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dickson	2	33.3%	1.2	39.1%	3	50.0%	1.8	58.5%	1	16.7%	0.1	2.4%
Fayette	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Fentress	1	50.0%	1.6	91.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.2	8.8%
Franklin	2	40.0%	2.0	79.6%	2	40.0%	0.3	13.6%	1	20.0%	0.2	6.8%
Gibson	1	25.0%	1.5	29.5%	2	50.0%	1.3	26.3%	1	25.0%	2.3	44.2%
Giles	1	14.3%	0.2	18.1%	2	28.6%	0.4	43.4%	4	57.1%	0.3	38.5%
Grainger	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0.1	20.0%	2	66.7%	0.4	80.0%
Greene	3	75.0%	1.2	88.5%	1	25.0%	0.2	11.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grundy	4	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamblen	2	50.0%	1.4	18.1%	1	25.0%	0.3	4.1%	1	25.0%	6.0	77.7%
Hamilton	6	15.8%	5.6	32.3%	31	81.6%	10.4	60.2%	1	2.6%	1.3	7.6%
Hancock	1	50.0%	0.1	55.6%	1	50.0%	0.1	44.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hardeman	4	66.7%	0.2	57.8%	2	33.3%	0.2	42.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hardin	8	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hawkins	7	100.0%	1.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Haywood	2	66.7%	0.3	45.9%	1	33.3%	0.3	54.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Henderson	1	33.3%	1.7	73.8%	2	66.7%	0.6	26.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Henry	3	75.0%	5.3	94.7%	1	25.0%	0.3	5.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Table D-17b. (continued)

	Conceptual				Planning & Design				Construction			
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in n	nillions]	Nui	nber	Cost [in i	millions]	Nur	nber	Cost [in r	nillions]
Hickman	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Houston	2	66.7%	0.2	63.2%	1	33.3%	0.1	36.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Humphreys	1	33.3%	0.1	32.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	0.3	67.1%
Jefferson	1	20.0%	0.1	3.8%	2	40.0%	0.1	4.9%	2	40.0%	2.4	91.3%
Johnson	2	66.7%	0.6	17.5%	1	33.3%	2.8	82.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Knox	12	41.4%	63.2	63.6%	11	37.9%	4.9	5.0%	6	20.7%	31.3	31.5%
Lake	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lauderdale	1	100.0%	3.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lawrence	2	50.0%	0.9	56.2%	2	50.0%	0.7	43.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lewis	4	100.0%	3.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lincoln	1	33.3%	1.2	82.8%	1	33.3%	0.1	3.4%	1	33.3%	0.2	13.8%
Loudon	2	28.6%	3.2	18.2%	3	42.9%	3.7	21.3%	2	28.6%	10.5	60.4%
McMinn	5	71.4%	2.7	81.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	0.6	18.8%
McNairy	9	64.3%	1.8	39.8%	5	35.7%	2.7	60.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Macon	2	66.7%	6.1	92.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0.5	7.6%
Madison	3	50.0%	1.4	30.3%	3	50.0%	3.1	69.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marion	1	50.0%	0.1	66.7%	1	50.0%	0.1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marshall	4	57.1%	1.3	25.6%	2	28.6%	3.6	72.7%	1	14.3%	0.1	1.7%
Maury	3	42.9%	0.7	4.1%	3	42.9%	1.9	12.0%	1	14.3%	13.5	83.9%
Meigs	1	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Monroe	3	60.0%	3.2	89.7%	2	40.0%	0.4	10.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Montgomery	5	35.7%	12.7	31.8%	6	42.9%	16.7	41.7%	3	21.4%	10.6	26.6%
Morgan	1	50.0%	0.1	26.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.3	73.1%
Overton	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Pickett	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Polk	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Putnam	4	80.0%	2.4	98.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0.1	2.0%
Rhea	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Roane	10	83.3%	8.0	97.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	16.7%	0.2	2.1%
Robertson	2	28.6%	0.2	1.6%	4	57.1%	8.9	95.2%	1	14.3%	0.3	3.2%
Rutherford	7	50.0%	17.4	65.8%	4	28.6%	7.6	28.9%	3	21.4%	1.4	5.3%
Scott	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	75.0%	4.3	98.8%	1	25.0%	0.1	1.2%
Sequatchie	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sevier	2	40.0%	0.9	60.2%	2	40.0%	0.5	30.1%	1	20.0%	0.1	9.7%
Shelby	14	14.4%	15.3	8.4%	61	62.9%	102.3	56.1%	22	22.7%	64.7	35.5%
Smith	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Appendix D: Reported Infrastructure Needs by County

				Ta	ble D-17	7b. (conti	nued)						
		Conceptual				Planning & Design				Construction			
County	Nur	nber	Cost [in i	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in i	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	nillions]	
Stewart	5	83.3%	2.3	77.2%	1	16.7%	0.7	22.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sullivan	17	73.9%	7.5	47.3%	3	13.0%	5.6	35.4%	3	13.0%	2.7	17.3%	
Sumner	4	33.3%	4.1	19.5%	7	58.3%	16.5	78.1%	1	8.3%	0.5	2.4%	
Tipton	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Unicoi	3	33.3%	1.3	55.1%	2	22.2%	0.3	14.4%	4	44.4%	0.7	30.5%	
Union	2	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Van Buren	2	100.0%	2.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Warren	1	50.0%	0.1	34.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.2	65.2%	
Washington	9	64.3%	7.9	71.4%	3	21.4%	1.2	10.9%	2	14.3%	2.0	17.6%	
Wayne	2	50.0%	0.4	29.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	0.9	70.1%	
Weakley	2	66.7%	0.6	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0.2	25.0%	
White	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	
Williamson	14	66.7%	49.9	89.9%	4	19.0%	2.4	4.3%	3	14.3%	3.2	5.8%	
Wilson	3	75.0%	6.5	30.2%	1	25.0%	15.0	69.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Regional	2	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Statewide	284	45.1%	\$ 313.3	37.6%	230	36.5%	\$ 285.3	34.3%	116	18.4%	\$ 234.4	28.1%	

<sup>\*</sup> Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Table D-18a. Libraries and Museums Projects by County

County         Number of Projects         Total Estimated Cost         Percent of Total Cost           Anderson         1         \$ 480,000         0.16           Bedford         1         4,500,000         0.96           Blount         2         572,198         0.16           Campbell         1         1,400,000         0.36           Cannon         1         75,000         0.06	t Cost in CIP 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 100.0% 0.0%	\$	ost Per Capita 7 117
Anderson       1       \$ 480,000       0.16         Bedford       1       4,500,000       0.96         Blount       2       572,198       0.16         Campbell       1       1,400,000       0.36	% 0.0% % 0.0% % 0.0% % 100.0% % 0.0%	\$ \$	7
Bedford         1         4,500,000         0.9°           Blount         2         572,198         0.1°           Campbell         1         1,400,000         0.3°	% 0.0% % 0.0% % 100.0% % 0.0%	\$	•
Blount 2 572,198 0.19 Campbell 1 1,400,000 0.39	% 0.0% % 100.0% % 0.0%		
Campbell 1 1,400,000 0.3	% 100.0% % 0.0%		5
	% 0.0%		35
[Carinori   75,000   0.0		_	6
Chester 1 100,000 0.00	% I 100 0%		6
Cumberland 3 2,475,000 0.5			52
Davidson 13 356,135,000 71.1			630
Decatur 1 180,000 0.0			15
DeKalb 2 600,000 0.1			34
Fentress 2 475,000 0.1			28
		_	11
1 7 1			18
Greene 1 300,000 0.1			5
Grundy 1 85,000 0.00			6
Hamilton 1 1,100,000 0.29			4
Hardeman 2 450,000 0.1			16
Hawkins 1 240,000 0.00			4
Henderson 1 250,000 0.0			10
Hickman 1 750,000 0.1			33
Humphreys 2 1,400,000 0.3			77
Jackson         2         1,400,000         0.3			125
Johnson 1 200,000 0.00			11
Knox 4 20,727,589 4.1			54
Loudon 1 750,000 0.19			19
McNairy 1 140,000 0.00			6
Macon 1 200,000 0.0°			10
Madison 1 420,000 0.1			5
Marion 3 900,000 0.29	% 0.0%		32
Maury 1 350,000 0.19	% 100.0%		5
Meigs 1 5,500,000 1.19	% 0.0%	\$	491
Monroe 2 2,000,000 0.4	% 50.0%	\$	50
Morgan 1 100,000 0.00	% 0.0%	\$	5
Overton 1 2,000,000 0.4	% 100.0%		99
Pickett 1 700,000 0.19	% 100.0%	\$	139
Polk 1 400,000 0.19			25
Roane 3 1,060,000 0.2°	% 5.7%	\$	20
Robertson 2 2,150,000 0.4	% 0.0%	\$	38
Rutherford 1 3,500,000 0.79	% 100.0%	\$	18
Scott 1 291,916 0.19	% 0.0%	\$	14
Sevier 1 2,500,000 0.5	% 0.0%	\$	34
Shelby 20 66,889,703 13.49	% 100.0%	\$	75
Smith 2 350,000 0.1			19
Sullivan 1 6,000,000 1.29			39
Sumner 2 2,300,000 0.5		_	17
Van Buren 1 200,000 0.00			37
Warren 1 1,400,000 0.39			36
White 1 300,000 0.19			13
Williamson 1 5,500,000 1.19			41
Statewide 101 \$ 500,616,006 100.00			88

<sup>\*</sup> Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

<sup>\*\*</sup>Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Appendix D: Reported Infrastructure Needs by County

Table D-18b. Library and Museum Projects by County and by Stage of Development

	Conceptual				Planning & Design				Construction			
County	Nur	nber	Cost [in	millions]	Nun	nber	Cost [in	millions]	Nun	nber	Cost [in i	millions]
Anderson	0	0%	\$ 0	0%	0	0%	\$ 0	0%	1	100%	\$ 0.5	100%
Bedford	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	4.5	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Blount	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0.6	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Campbell	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1.4	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Cannon	1	100%	0.1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Chester	1	100%	0.1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Cumberland	1	33%	2.0	81%	1	33%	0.4	14%	1	33%	0.1	5%
Davidson	7	54%	100.9	28%	4	31%	167.7	47%	2	15%	87.6	25%
Decatur	1	100%	0.2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
DeKalb	2	100%	0.6	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Fentress	2	100%	0.5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Franklin	2	67%	0.3	56%	1	33%	0.2	44%	0	0%	0	0%
Grainger	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0.4	100%
Greene	1	100%	0.3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Grundy	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0.1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Hamilton	1	100%	1.1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Hardeman	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0.5	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Hawkins	1	100%	0.2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Henderson	1	100%	0.3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Hickman	1	100%	0.8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Humphreys	2		1.4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Jackson	2	100%	1.4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Johnson	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0.2	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Knox	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	4.0	19%	2	50%	16.7	81%
Loudon	1	100%	0.8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
McNairy	1	100%	0.1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Macon	1	100%	0.2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Madison	1	100%	0.4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Marion	2	67%	0.7	72%	1	33%	0.3	28%	0	0%	0	0%
Maury	1	100%	0.4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Meigs	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	5.5	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Monroe	2	100%	2.0	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Table D-18b. (continued)

	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,											
		Conc	eptual			Planning	& Design			Consti	ruction	
County	Nun	nber	Cost [in I	millions]	Nun	nber	Cost [in I	millions]	Nun	nber	Cost [in r	nillions]
Morgan	1	100%	0.1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Overton	1	100%	2.0	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Pickett	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0.7	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Polk	1	100%	0.4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Roane	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%	1.0	94%	1	33%	0.1	6%
Robertson	1	50%	2.0	93%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0.2	7%
Rutherford	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	3.5	100%
Scott	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0.3	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Sevier	1	100%	2.5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Shelby	2	10%	8.2	12%	8	40%	35.1	53%	10	50%	23.6	35%
Smith	2	100%	0.4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Sullivan	1	100%	6.0	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Sumner	2	100%	2.3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Van Buren	1	100%	0.2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Warren	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1.4	100%
White	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0.3	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Williamson	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	5.5	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Statewide	48	48%	\$ 138.5	28%	32	32%	\$ 228.1	46%	21	21%	\$ 134.0	27%

<sup>\*</sup> Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Table D-19a. Community Development Projects by County

Country	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Co	st Per
County	Projects	Cost	<b>Total Cost</b>	Cost in CIP	C	apita
Anderson	1	\$ 1,088,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$	15
Bedford	2	25,150,000	6.1%	0.0%	\$	656
Bledsoe	3	16,250,000	4.0%	92.3%	\$	1,298
Blount	2	2,050,000	0.5%	97.6%	\$	19
Bradley	2	9,500,000	2.3%	0.0%	\$	107
Cannon	1	500,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	39
Carroll	3	2,655,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$	90
Carter	1	50,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	1
Cheatham	2	3,300,000	0.8%	0.0%	\$	90
Cocke	2	300,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	9
Coffee	1	4,000,000	1.0%	0.0%	\$	82
Cumberland	3	585,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	12
Davidson	12	129,576,000	31.6%	100.0%	\$	229
DeKalb	3	3,000,000	0.7%	100.0%	\$	171
Dickson	1	400,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	9
Fentress	1	100,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$	6
Franklin	1	100,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	3
Giles	4	20,305,000	4.9%	0.0%	\$	684
Greene	2	125,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	2
Hamilton	3	2,650,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$	9
Hancock	2	700,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	103
Hardin	1	600,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	23
Hawkins	4	2,460,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$	45
Haywood	1	60,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$	3
Henderson	2	550,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	21
Henry	2	1,400,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	45
Jackson	2	700,000	0.2%	57.1%	\$	63
Jefferson	1	125,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	3
Knox	2	2,668,750	0.7%	100.0%	\$	7
Lake	2	200,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	26
Lawrence	1	7,500,000	1.8%	0.0%	\$	187
Lincoln	1	3,000,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$	95
Loudon	1	466,008	0.1%	100.0%	\$	12
McNairy	3	500,000	0.1%			20
Macon	1	3,000,000	0.1%			144
Madison	1	130,000	0.7 %	100.0%	\$	144
Marshall	4	1,550,000	0.4%	43.2%	\$	57
Maury	2	540,000	0.4 %	100.0%	\$	8
Meigs	1	350,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	31
Monroe	1		0.1%	0.0%	\$	15
Perry	2	600,000 550,000	0.1%	0.0%		73
,	3	700,000				
Putnam		· ·	0.2%	85.7%		11
Roane	1	250,000	0.1%	100.0%		5
Robertson	5	1,735,000	0.4%	28.8%	\$	31

Table D-19a. (continued)

County	Number of Projects	Total Estimated Cost	Percent of Total Cost	Percent Cost in CIP	Cost Per Capita
Scott	1	2,500,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$ 116
Sevier	1	1,500,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$ 20
Shelby	19	122,869,294	29.9%	100.0%	\$ 137
Smith	3	600,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 33
Stewart	2	600,000	0.1%	33.3%	\$ 47
Sullivan	1	400,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 3
Sumner	5	14,500,000	3.5%	0.0%	\$ 108
Tipton	2	350,000	0.1%	28.6%	\$ 7
Unicoi	4	12,895,300	3.1%	0.0%	\$ 728
Van Buren	1	100,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$ 18
Wayne	1	500,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 30
White	2	850,000	0.2%	11.8%	\$ 36
Williamson	2	800,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$ 6
Statewide Total	140	\$ 410,483,352	100.0%	70.3%	\$ 72

<sup>\*</sup> Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

<sup>\*\*</sup>Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Appendix D: Reported Infrastructure Needs by County

Table D-19b. Community Development Projects by County and by Stage of Development

	Conceptual						g & Desigr		Construction				
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions1	Nu	mber	Cost [in		Nu	mber	Cost [in r	millions1	
Anderson	0	0.0%	\$ 0			0.0%	\$ 0		1	100.0%		100.0%	
Bedford	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		50.0%	25.0		1	50.0%	0.2	0.6%	
Bledsoe	2	66.7%	1.3	7.7%		0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	15.0	92.3%	
Blount	1	50.0%	0.1	2.4%	1	50.0%	2.0	97.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Bradley	1	50.0%	2.5	26.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	7.0	73.7%	
Cannon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	2.1	78.3%	1	33.3%	0.6	21.7%	
Carter	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Cheatham	2	100.0%	3.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Cocke	2	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Coffee	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	4.0	100.0%	
Cumberland	2	66.7%	0.4	68.4%	1	33.3%	0.2	31.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Davidson	1	8.3%	0.4	0.3%	6	50.0%	21.8	16.8%	5	41.7%	107.4	82.8%	
DeKalb	3	100.0%	3.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Dickson	1	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Fentress	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.070	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Franklin	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Giles	2	50.0%	15.1	74.2%		25.0%	0.2	1.1%	1	25.0%	5.0	24.6%	
Greene	1	50.0%	0.1	60.0%	1	50.0%	0.1	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Hamilton	1	33.3%	0.1	4.7%	2	66.7%	2.5		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Hancock	1	50.0%	0.3	42.9%	1	50.0%	0.4	57.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Hardin	1	100.0%	0.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Hawkins	4	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Haywood	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	
Henderson	1	50.0%	0.2	36.4%		50.0%	0.4	63.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Henry	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	1.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Jackson	2	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0,0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Jefferson	0		0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Knox	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.2	6.3%	1	50.0%	2.5	93.7%	
Lake	2	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Lawrence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	7.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Lincoln	0	0.070	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	3.0		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Loudon	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
McNairy	3	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Macon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	3.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	

Table D-19b. (continued)

	Conceptual					Planning	g & Desigr	ı	Construction				
County	Nur	nber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	nillions]	
Madison	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Marshall	2	50.0%	0.9	60.0%	1	25.0%	0.4	27.1%	1	25.0%	0.2	12.9%	
Maury	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.1	25.9%	1	50.0%	0.4	74.1%	
Meigs	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Monroe	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.6	100.0%	
Perry	1	50.0%	0.5	90.9%	1	50.0%	0.1	9.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Putnam	2	66.7%	0.6	85.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0.1	14.3%	
Roane	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	
Robertson	2	40.0%	0.8	43.2%	2	40.0%	0.5	28.0%	1	20.0%	0.5	28.8%	
Scott	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sevier	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	
Shelby	1	5.3%	0.4	0.3%	6	31.6%	22.3	18.2%	12	63.2%	100.2	81.5%	
Smith	1	33.3%	0.2	33.3%	2	66.7%	0.4	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Stewart	1	50.0%	0.4	66.7%	1	50.0%	0.2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sullivan	1	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sumner	4	80.0%	14.0	96.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0.5	3.4%	
Tipton	1	50.0%	0.3	71.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.1	28.6%	
Unicoi	2	50.0%	4.6	35.6%	2	50.0%	8.3	64.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Van Buren	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	
Wayne	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
White	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0.9	100.0%	
Williamson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0.8	100.0%	
Statewide	55	39.3%	\$ 56.0	13.6%	44	31.4%	\$ 105.2	25.6%	41	29.3%	\$ 249.3	60.7%	

<sup>\*</sup> Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Table D-20a. Business District Development Projects by County

County	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Cost Per
	Projects <b>Projects</b>	Cost		Cost in CIP	Capita
Blount	1	\$ 2,200,000	0.9%		\$ 20
Bradley	1	875,000	0.4%	0.0%	
Carroll	1	500,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$ 17
Claiborne	1	500,000	0.2%	0.0%	
Coffee	1	3,500,000	1.4%	0.0%	\$ 72
Cumberland	1	6,000,000	2.4%	100.0%	\$ 125
Davidson	1	3,050,000	1.2%	100.0%	\$ 5
Dyer	1	50,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 1
Fayette	1	350,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 11
Giles	1	250,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 8
Greene	1	200,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 3
Hamblen	1	200,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 3
Hamilton	5	116,800,000	47.3%	1.3%	\$ 380
Hardeman	1	75,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 3
Hardin	3	500,000	0.2%	40.0%	\$ 19
Hawkins	1	706,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 13
Haywood	2	740,000	0.3%	32.4%	\$ 37
Hickman	1	650,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 29
Knox	4	48,380,000	19.6%	100.0%	\$ 125
McMinn	3	7,750,000	3.1%	85.2%	\$ 155
McNairy	3	1,132,000	0.5%	39.8%	\$ 46
Madison	2	15,000,000	6.1%	100.0%	\$ 162
Marion	1	500,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 18
Marshall	1	225,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 8
Maury	4	5,750,000	2.3%	65.2%	\$ 82
Obion	1	600,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 19
Polk	1	256,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 16
Putnam	1	2,000,000	0.8%	100.0%	\$ 32
Rhea	1	750,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 26
Rutherford	2	11,500,000	4.7%	100.0%	\$ 60
Sequatchie	1	300,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 26
Shelby	3	6,521,000	2.6%	100.0%	\$ 7
Smith	1	1,000,000	0.4%	100.0%	\$ 56
Sullivan	1	250,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 2
Unicoi	1	1,000,000	0.1%	0.0%	
Washington	3	6,800,000	2.8%	92.6%	\$ 63
Wayne	3	279,260	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 17
Statewide Total	62	\$ 247,139,260	100.0%	46.0%	\$ 43
otatewide rotal	<del></del>	Ψ 271,100,200	100.0 /0	TU.U /0	Ψ

<sup>\*</sup> Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

<sup>\*\*</sup>Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Table D-20b. Business District Development Projects by County and by Stage of Development

	Conceptual					Plannin	g & Design	1	Construction			
County	Nui	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Nur	nber	Cost [in r	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	nillions]
Blount	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%	1	100.0%	\$ 2.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%
Bradley	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Claiborne	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Coffee	1	100.0%	3.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cumberland	1	100.0%	6.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Davidson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	3.1	100.0%
Dyer	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Fayette	1	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Giles	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Greene	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamblen	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamilton	1	20.0%	11.0	9.4%	3	60.0%	62.3	53.3%	1	20.0%	43.5	37.2%
Hardeman	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hardin	2	66.7%	0.2	40.0%	1	33.3%	0.3	60.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hawkins	1	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Haywood	2	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hickman	1	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Knox	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	48.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
McMinn	1	33.3%	0.7	8.4%	1	33.3%	0.5	6.5%	1	33.3%	6.6	85.2%
McNairy	1	33.3%	0.1	8.8%	1	33.3%	0.4	30.9%	1	33.3%	0.7	60.2%
Madison	2	100.0%	15.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marion	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marshall	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%
Maury	2	50.0%	5.0	87.0%	1	25.0%	0.1	1.7%	1	25.0%	0.7	11.3%
Obion	1	100.0%	0.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Polk	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Putnam	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Rhea	1	100.0%	0.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Rutherford	1	50.0%	3.0		1	50.0%	8.5	73.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sequatchie	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Shelby	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	2.8	42.6%	1	33.3%	3.7	57.4%

Appendix D: Reported Infrastructure Needs by County

Table D-20b. (continued)													
	Conceptual					Planning	g & Design	1		Construction			
County	Number Cost [in millions]			Nui	Number Cost [in millions]			Nu	mber	Cost [in millions]			
Smith	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sullivan	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Unicoi	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Washington	2	66.7%	6.5	95.6%	1	33.3%	0.3	4.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Wayne	2	66.7%	0.2	64.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0.1	35.8%	

23

37.1% \$ 128.8

52.1%

12.9% \$

8

23.7%

58.6

31

59.8

24.2%

Statewide

<sup>50.0% \$</sup> \* Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.